G-102T-P

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

REILLY TAR & CHEMICAL CORPORATIO

TO: MR. P. C. REILLY - INDPLS. OFFICE: St. Louis Park

FROM: Mr. H. L. Finch DATE: September 24, 1969

SUBJECT: AIR POLLUTION - ST. LOUIS PARK - LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The source of complaints from the citizens of St. Louis Park have resulted from our still operations. The odors come from the vent stacks over the pans in which our distillate is collected. We do have other sources of odors, such as when the stills are blown to receiving tanks, when roofing pitch is being drummed, and when we load and unload tank cars. Also, in the treating operations, odors will be present from the opening of cylinder doors, the cooling of a hot charge of treated material, and the venting of hot storage tanks of treating preservatives. These other odors have not been the source of complaints as they are not of prolonged duration and apparently can be dispersed readily in the air and do not hang close to the ground.

I feel that we are not the only plant that is faced with the problems of odoriferous pollution of the air as a result of still operations. It is my recommendation that a study be made on a company wide basis to determine the best possible means of control of odor pollution from all plants. Study would entail each plant's particular problem but I feel quite certain that a general method of control can be most economically developed by an over all study.

Correspondence has taken place between St. Louis Park and Indianapolis in the last several years with regard to pollution of the water, ground and air. We started off in the fall of 1960, pointing out the problems of smoke and odor control at St. Louis Park. Our conversion to gas has eliminated the problem of smoke as a part of pollution. My recommendations in 1960 were to increase the capacity of our condensers and also increase their efficiency by the circulation of colder water. At this time I felt that condensable vapors were being discharged into the atmosphere and contributing to our odor problem. The reason for the recommendations of increased cooling capacity resulted from observation that during the winter months the odors from the stills were less detectable. Also, during the summer months the greater number of our complaints occurred during the distillation of the final pan when the temperatures of the stills are the highest and the cooling water temperature is the least efficient.

St. Louis Park has in the past eight years reduced the odors coming from the stills because we have a greater measure of

control of the distillation with the fire tube stills than we had with the old dutch oven stills. We have also tried to get the greatest efficiency from the cooling water that we had available and have not recirculated our cooling water during high atmospheric temperatures.

Two years ago when the air pollution ordinance was proposed in the City of St. Louis Park, we again had considerable exchange of ideas concerning how to control the fumes coming from the distillation of coal tar. No conclusions were developed and no authorization was given of a procedure to follow. In January of this year, knowing that we would likely be faced with numerous complaints during the summer months because pollution was on everybody's agenda, it was decided that we would move forward.

The following program was initiated:

1. Install air condensers on all three of our receiving tanks.

2. Install a simplified spray scrubber system to be attached to the air condenser on our two main receiving tanks. (After checking the results of the simplified spray scrubber system we would then decide it's value in setting up a collection from the vent stacks on the distillate pans and if sufficiently satisfactory, we would then proceed with step 3).

3. Install a collection system for the fumes coming from the vent stacks from the pans and draw these fumes through a simplified scrubber.

4. Build an auxiliary condenser to be included after our scrubbing as a final effort to remove condensable odoriferous fumes.

I have been informed that there are non condensable gasses that are driven off during the distillation process and I also understand that some of these are possibly burnable. As a further step should we still be in difficulty, we may have to consider the incineration of remaining fumes. From our preliminary investigations with the gas company, they have assured us that they can burn these fumes. The only problem involved is the high cost of incineration. In order to consider the gas company's proposal, it is imperative that we utilize the heat developed. My recommendation again would be to have a qualified individual thoroughly acquaint himself with the problem of

removal of odoriferous material resulting from distillation of tar, thoroughly acquaint himself with the probable new devices, new methods and then make recommendations as to procedures to be followed for the eventual elimination of objectionable odors from our distillation plants.

In answer to your postscript, Mrs. Theurer lives northeast of the plant (about three quarters of a mile) and would be affected primarily with the southwest wind. Mrs. Theurer's rather flagrant description, of course, over emphasizes the problem.

Yesterday, September 22nd, we had a call from a neighbor living in the same direction as Mr. Theurer, only about one half mile from the plant. We did not take this individual's name but at least received the block in which she lived. Mr. Justin then took a trip to the location and said that the odor was faintly detectable. At this time we were completing our still run. Mr. Justin reported that odor was much more detectable only a quarter mile from the plant.

The weather conditions were - temperature of about 74 degrees, slightly raining, with a three to five mile an hour wind coming from the southwest.

Yours very truly,

H. L. Finch

HLF:ge

cc: Mr. T. E. Reilly - Indpls.
Mr. T. J. Ryan - Indpls.